

E449 Rev. Brown,
R224 Hugh

Review of Dr.
Raphael's discourse
on American
Slavery

1861

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00017069299

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-19.

27.5
5619
E 449
.R224
Copy 1

REVIEW
OF
REV. DR. RAPHAEL'S DISCOURSE
ON
"American Slavery as being consistent with the
Hebrew Servitude of the Old Testament,"
A
SERMON

Preached (by request) in the Baptist Church, Shushan,
on Wednesday, March 27th, 1861.

BY

REV HUGH BROWN,
PASTOR OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, EAST SALEM
WASHINGTON COUNTY, N. Y.

"Is not this the fast I have chosen? to let the oppressed go free, and
that ye break every yoke;"--Isaiah LVIII. 6.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

NORTH WHITE CREEK, N. Y.
R. K. CROCKER, WASHINGTON CO. POST, PRINT.
1861.

522

R224

47
284

10. 30. 28
T
Oct. 8, 24/2/11

REVIEW.

"Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness;"
Ex. vii. 16.

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets;"
Matt. vii. 12.

"Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbour's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work;" Jer. xxii. 13.

"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal;"
Col. iv. 1.

Christian friends;—at the urgent solicitations of several individuals, belonging to different religious denominations, I have consented to reply to two very strange discourses lately delivered, one in defence of "American slavery as being consistent with the Hebrew servitude of the Old Testament"; and the other on "the character and influence of Abolitionism." The first of these was delivered by Rev. Dr. Raphaël, Jewish Rabbi, in the Green street Jewish Synagogue, New York, on Jan. 4th, 1861; and since repeated, and published in the *New York Herald* and other newspapers. The second was preached by Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church, (U. S.) Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sabbath evening, Dec. 9th, 1860, and published at the time in several journals, and since in pamphlet form, and most industriously and widely circulated: at least in this part of the country. Although I did, partly consent, when first requested to reply to said discourses, yet on farther consideration I considered it perhaps wiser to let them pass merely for what they were worth, until I was solicited a second time; and this partly accounts for the reason why I appear at so late a period with the following rejoinder. I very much regret that the defence of some of the positions I shall feel constrained to advocate, had not fallen into abler hands. And as regards the duty of ministers to preach on the subject of slavery, I have merely to say, that necessity is laid upon us, since like the

frogs in Egypt, the land is swarming with philo-slavery sermons, and in a'most every house. Besides this, the Bible makes it the duty of ministers to preach against *all* sin; and in Isa. lviii. 1, it is said, "cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." And in Ezek. iii. 17, "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me."

We shall endeavor then to notice the principal or most important parts or statements in both discourses with as much briefness and perspicuity as possible, not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God upon the subject. As there is however a close similarity, in some places, between the discourses, we may here notice that our reply to one will serve at the same time as an answer to the other wherein they correspond or agree. While then, it is specially our design to direct your attention to the subjects as discussed in these sermons, yet as the application made us contemplated a farther and fuller account of the resemblance, if any, between the Hebrew servitude of the Bible, and American slavery, and also their dissimilarity; we shall endeavor to embrace as far as possible the design contemplated under the following method of arrangement.

First, Review briefly the sermons of Rev. Dr. Raphael, in defence of "American Slavery, as being consistent with the Hebrew servitude of the Old Testament"; and of Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, on "the character and influence of Abolitionism,"

Second, Consider in a few words, the Hebrew servitude of the Old Testament.

Third, Notice concisely what American Slavery is.

Fourth, Point out some of the differences between the Hebrew servitude of the Bible, and American Slavery.

Fifth, Show that the word of God gives no sanction to American slavery, but condemns it.

Sixth, Reply to some arguments, which are commonly used in justification of slavery.

First, Review briefly the sermon of Rev Dr. Raphael, in defence of "American slavery, as being consistent with the Hebrew servitude of the Old Testament"; and of Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, on "the character and influence of Abolitionism."

And we shall notice first, the sermon of Rev. Dr. Raphael. Before, however, entering directly on his discourse, allow us to preface with a few remarks. Dr. Raphael, it is well known, is a Jewish Rabbi, and therefore the impression on the minds of some is, that he must know the Hebrew of the Bible so profoundly that it is absolutely impossible for him to be mistaken on the subject of slavery; and that what he affirms respecting it, is, as true almost as the word of God itself. Now while we have no reason to doubt the learning or scholarship of the Rev. Rabbi, yet it is to be carefully observed, that of all expositors of the sacred oracles, the Jewish Doctor's are the most miserable and deceptive. This arises from two causes, viz. their love in traditions, for it is a known fact that the Talmud is preferred by them to the sacred Scriptures; hence our Saviour says of them in Matt. xv. 3, 2, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" And "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The other cause arises from what Paul by the Holy Spirit says of them in ii Cor. iii. 14, 15. "But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which vail is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart." You must bear in mind then, that the discourse comes from one, Rabbi though he be, concerning whom the Spirit of the living God asserts, "that his mind is blinded," and that in reading the law of Moses (and of course on servitude) there is "a vail upon his heart." Can you put confidence in the teachings of one who with the Old Testament in his hand maintains, that the Messiah is not yet come, and that Jesus of Nazareth was an imposture. Certainly not. Hence "the vail," spoken of by the Apostle was so impenetrable, that when delivering his sermon on

slavery, although it was about noon of the day, the *Herald*, in reporting the services at the Synagogue, says, "on either side of the rostrum or speaking desk burned wax tapers of large dimensions."

But with these precautionary remarks, let us now notice the sermon. The Rev. Dr. selected for his text, Jonah iii. 3—10, where the people of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, and God turned away the evil that he had said he would inflict upon them. To suppose, however, that the sermon preached from this text bears any resemblance to the occasion on which it was delivered, (a national fast day) would be a most egregious mistake. The subject for discussion is divided by the Dr. into three propositions:—"1st, How far back can we trace the existence of slavery?" "2d, Is slaveholding condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture?" And "3rd, What was the condition of the slave in biblical times among the Hebrews?"

In reviewing then each of these propositions, it cannot reasonably be expected that we can expatiate on every statement and expression made use of ; but we design to investigate the truth or fallacy of all the leading arguments employed, and also the bearing of each passage of the word of God as pressed into the service for the support of slavery.

And 1st, "How far back can we trace the existence of slavery?" In answer to this, the Lr. says, "we find the word *ngebed*, slave, which the English version renders "servant," first used by Noah, who, in Genesis ix. 25, curses the descendants of his son Ham, by saying, they should be *ngebed ngubadim*, (or *eveth avothim*) 'the meanest of slaves.' or as the English version has it, "servant of servants," Now in this there are three fallacies; first, there is no such definite term as the English word *slave* found in the original of the Scriptures; and the translators have never in a single instance translated *eveth*, nor any one of the original words into the definite term *slave*. The word *slave* is not to be found in either the Old or New Testament Scriptures except in two places; thus in Jer. ii. 14, it is said, "Is Israel a servant? is he a home-born *slave*?" But here there is no word in the original answering to the word *slave* in

the English version, and hence the translators knowing this put the word *slave* in italics. The other instance where you find the word *slave* or *slaves* is in Rev. xviii. 13, where it is said, "and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." But the word here translated "slaves," is neither *andrapoda*, (slaves) nor *douloi*, (servants;) but *somaton*, which is literally *bodies*. But second, the curse pronounced on Canaan is only a *prediction*, and not a rule of conduct, hence it proves nothing as regards the lawfulness of slavery, neither is there the slightest evidence that slavery was the thing predicted. And third, it is not true that Noah "cursed the descendants of his son Ham," as stated by Dr. Raphael. The passage in Gen. ix. 25, reads thus, "cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." It was not Ham then, but Canaan that was cursed; hence the curse is misapplied to the Africans; for they are not the descendants of Canaan, but of other sons of Ham whom Noah did not curse. The devoted nations, however, whom God destroyed before Israel, were descended from Canaan; and the Hebrews, who had been servants in Egypt, took possession of the land of Canaan, and those of them that were not destroyed were reduced to tributaries. Now in this sense, Canaan, in his descendants, was "a servant of servants," that is, a servant to those who had been themselves servants in Egypt. Also the Canaanites have long since ceased to be a distinct people, and the prediction has long since been fulfilled. Canaan had eleven sons; his eldest son, Sidon, founded the city of Sidon, and was father of the Sidonians and Phœnicians. His other ten sons, were fathers of as many tribes, dwelling in Palestine and Syria: Gen. x. 15—19. But Ham had three other sons, viz. Cush, Mizraim, and Phut. To the Cushites, or descendants of his eldest son, Cush, were allotted the southern regions of Asia, along the coasts of the Persian gulf. And to the sons of Mizraim were allotted Egypt, and Libya in Africa; and the first great empires of Assyria and Egypt were founded by them: Gen. x. 6—14. It is evident then that Canaan, alone in his descendants, is cursed, and Ham only in that branch of his posterity. Hence it

follows, that the subjugation of the Canaanitish races to Israel fulfils the prophecy; and to them it was limited, and with them it expired. Part of the seven nations of the Canaanites were made tributaries to the Israelites, when they took possession of their land; and the remainder by Solomon.

But it is still objected, by the advocates of slavery, that though Canaan is the one *named* in the curse, it cannot refer specially to him, but to the posterity of Ham in general, and so proves negro slavery. Now for proof of this Gen. ix. 22, is quoted, thus, "And Ham the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of their father, and told his two brethren without." Then in v. 23rd, Shem and Japhet cover their father with a garment. And in v. 24th it is said, "and Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him." It is argued from this, that the *younger son* here spoken of cannot be *Canaan*, as he was not the *son* but the *grandson* of Noah, and therefore it must mean *Ham*. We reply, that whoever that "younger son" was, *Canaan* is the only one cursed. Besides this, the Hebrew word *Ben*, or *Beno*, here translated son, means also a *grandson*. Thus for example in Gen. xxix 5, it is said; "know ye Laban the *son* (ben) of Nahor?" But Laban was not the son, but *grandson* of Nahor; Gen. xxiv. 15, 29. Again, in Gen. xxxi, 28, Laban said to Jacob, "and hast not suffered me to kiss my *sons* and my daughters;" and at v. 55th of same chapter, "early in the morning Laban rose up, and kissed his *sons*." But the context shews, that they were not his sons, but his *grandsons*. Also in Ruth iv. 17, it is said, "there is a son born to Naomi." But this child was the son of Ruth, the daughter-in-law of Naomi, and hence her legal *grandson*. Farther, in ii Samuel xix. 24; it is said, "and Mephibosheth the son of Saul came down to meet the king." But in ii Samuel ix. 6., we find, that Mephibosheth was the son of Jonathan, and hence the *grandson* of Saul. And once more, it is said in ii Kings ix. 20; "the driving is like the driving of Jehu the son of Nimshi." But in the 2nd and 14th verses of the same chapter, we are told, that Jehu was the son of Jehosh-

aphat, and hence he was the *grandson* of Nimsli. Now in all these passages of the word of God, it is the same Hebrew word that is used in Gen. ix. 24: and there translated *son*, meaning thereby that Canaan was the *grandson* of Noah, and on him the curse was pronounced. But farther here, it is to be noticed, that the Hebrew word *Hakauton*, translated *younger* in v. 24th means *small* or *little*. It is the very same word that is translated *small* in Ps. cxv. 13: "He will bless them that fear the Lord, both *small* and great." And it is also the very same Hebrew word which is rendered *little* in Isaiah lx. 22: "a *little* one shall become a thousand." It would then be a literal rendering of Gen. ix. 24, 25; were it translated thus; "when Noah knew what his *little grandson* (Heb. *Hakauton beno*) had done unto him; he said, cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." We might here also add, that the curse pronounced on Canaan, was a curse to those who were under it, and not an institution to be encouraged for their advantage. It was a curse for a just cause, and hence the very utmost that it would prove in behalf of slavery, is, that it is a punishment for crimes. But what crimes have the negroes committed on the inhabitants of America that they should hold them in perpetual bondage? Let Dr. Raphael answer.

Besides, if God had *predicted* the enslavement of the Africans, that would be no divine warrant for American slavery. It is the *moral law*, and not prophecy, that is to be the rule of our conduct. If prophecy is to be the guide and standard of our actions, then the "betrayers and murderers" of Jesus Christ were justified in what they did, for they exactly fulfilled the words of the prophets. But were they without blame? No verily. And hence Peter charges home upon them the guilt of crucifying the Lord of glory; he says in Acts ii. 23. "ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."

But hear the Dr's. line of argument in "tracing back the existence of slavery." He asks "How came Noah to use this expression? How came he to know anything of slavery?" Now such language as this takes for granted that

the expression used by Noah, viz. "cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren," meant slavery and nothing else. But this is one of the points to be proved. The passage may appear to favor slavery to an individual reading it "with a veil upon the heart," and with the dim light of "a wax taper." But when viewed through a spiritual telescope—the mind enlightened by the Spirit of Christ—there is not the smallest spec of American slavery discernable in it. But hear the Dr's. supposition how Noah came to use the expression. He says, "the word slave and the nature of slavery must date from before the flood." Now is not this an invention worthy a Jewish Rabbi. When neither the word of God, nor the traditions of his own church will help him out of the difficulty; he constructs a bridge of hypothetical conjectures to span the mighty chasm, and then transporting himself into regions of mystecism exclaims; "slave and slavery were household words before the flood," and as children are early prone to learn bad expressions, he has made the discovery that Noah was once a child, and not only learned, but treasured up in his memory, "the sum of all villanies," slave and slavery. Why in ii Peter ii. 5, the Apostle tells us, that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness," and hence we have reason to suppose, that the prediction denounced by him concerning Canaan and his descendants, was by the spirit of prophecy. But on Dr. Raphael's method of interpretation, there must have been a world before the present one, and inhabited by exactly the same kinds of living creatures, and known by precisely the same names; and Adam must then have been a little boy, for in Gen. ii. 20; it is said, "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field." But why contend for the antiquity of slavery? Suppose it was older than the flood, would that be proof that it is of divine appointment? Dr. Raphael seems to think so. But if the antiquity of a thing is evidence for Jehovah's approbation of it, then murder may be committed with impunity, and with the sanction of heaven, for Cain killed his brother long before the flood. And there is just as good grounds for maintaining, on Dr.

Raphael's mode of reasoning, that murder is a divine institution, as to say that slavery is of God's appointment, because Noah learned to lisp the words "slave and slavery before the flood." But before leaving this part of his subject, the Dr. adds, "Noah did not bestow any blessing on his son Ham, but uttered a bitter curse against his descendants; and to this day it remains a fact which cannot be gainsayed that in his own native home, and generally throughout the world, the unfortunate negro is indeed the meanest of slaves. I do not attempt to build up a theory, I state facts." Now where, we ask, are the "facts" in this statement? Is it, that Noah uttered a bitter curse against the descendants of Ham? It cannot be, for in Gen. ix. 25, you will find the Dr's. "fact" to be a downright falsehood. But is it "a fact" that the negroes are descended from Canaan whom Noah cursed? Why the veriest tyro in history would pronounce such an assertion an untruth. And is it "a fact to this day which cannot be gainsayed," that the descendants of Canaan, are "in their own native home, the meanest of slaves?" Why the Bible informs us that God drove out the inhabitants of Canaan, that is, the descendants of Canaan whom Noah cursed, from before the Hebrews; and the Canaanites have long since ceased to be a distinct people. It is true, that many Africans, are descendants of other branches of Ham's family, and that they have been cruelly enslaved; but so have other tribes in different parts of the world. But there is certainly no proof that the negro race were ever placed under the malediction of Noah. But even suppose they were, that would not, as we have already said, justify the sin of slaveholding, nor prove that christianity is not designed to remove the evil of slavery. This is all we consider necessary to say in refutation of the groundless assertions made by the Dr. under his first proposition.

We come now to notice the second proposition of Rev. Dr. Raphael, viz. "Is slaveholding condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture?"

In entering on a discussion of this topic the Dr. commences in the following manner. "How this question can at

all arise in the mind of any man that has received a religious education, and is acquainted with the history of the Bible, is a phenomenon I cannot explain to myself, and which fifty years ago no man dreamt of." Now is it a fact, as the Dr. here states, that "fifty years ago no man dreamt," that "slaveholding is condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture?" To show how little credit is to be placed in the statements of this learned Rabbi, permit me to notice a few of the early testimonies of some of the most learned, pious, and devoted philanthropists that ever adorned the pages of history. The Methodist Society, in 1780, before the church was regularly organized in the United States, resolved as follows, "The conference acknowledges that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and true religion; and doing what we would not others should do unto us." And this was the unanimous opinion of the conference 80 years ago. Also, the Presbyterian church, in 1793, inserted the following note to the 8th commandment in the Book of Discipline, as expressing the doctrine of the church on slaveholding: "i Tim. i. 10. The law is made for MAN-STEALERS. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment, Exodus xxi. 16; and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or *in retaining them in it*. Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and KEEP, SELL, OR BUY THEM. To steal a free man, says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances, we only steal human property; but where we steal or retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant lords of the earth." This then was the decision of the Presbyterian church 63 years ago, and expressed in plain and forcible language. We have also the testimony of Wilberforce in 1788, a statesman who shone with brilliancy in the British Senate, even when men were dazzled with the splendor of Pitt and Fox. And

again in 1791, in the English parliament when he was supported by Pitt, and Fox, and William Smity, and Bailie, and other members, and this was 70 years ago. John Wesley also, who was born in 1703, and ordained in 1725, and who came to America in 1735, declared "American slavery," to be "the vilest that ever saw the sun," and constituting "the sum of all villanies;" and this was upwards of 120 years ago. And yet Dr. R. says, "fifty years ago no man dreamt that slaveholding is condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture." Again, Bishop Warburton, in 1676, preached a sermon, denouncing, in strong language, those who "talk of property in rational creatures, as of herds of cattle;" and this sermon was preached 184 years ago. Dr. Porteus, Bishop of London, in 1788, vindicated the Bible against the assertion, that is sanctioned slavery—"Nay," (said he) "it classed men-stealers or slave-traders among the murderers of fathers and mothers, and the most profane criminals on earth;" and this was 73 years ago. George Whitfield in a letter to the inhabitants of Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, in 1739, used, among other expressions, the following language on the sin of slaveholding: He said, "as I lately passed through your provinces in my way hither, I was sensibly touched with a fellow-feeling for the miseries of the poor negroes. Sure I am it is sinful, when they have bought them, to use them as bad as though they were brutes, nay worse; for your slaves, I believe, work as hard, if not harder than the horses whom you ride. Your dogs are caressed and fondled at your table; but your slaves, who are frequently styled dogs or beasts, have not an equal privilege. Not to mention what numbers have been given up to the inhuman usage of cruel taskmasters, who, by their unrelenting scourges have ploughed their backs, and made long furrows, and at length brought them even unto death." Now this language was used 122 years ago; and yet Dr. Raphael says, "no man fifty years ago dreamt" that it was a sin. But the time would fail me to speak of Bishop Horsley, Archdeacon Paley, Bishop Butler, John Jay, James Monroe, Edmund Burk, Blackstone, the jurist, and the learned

Grotius, all of whom denounced slaveholding in the most unmeasured terms as a sin condemned by the Sacred Scriptures. Also in a pamphlet, entitled "observations on the American Revolution," and published by order of Congress, in 1779; that is, 82 years ago, the following sentiment, among others, is declared to the world, viz: The great principle (of government) is and ever will remain in force, *that men are by nature free*. What revives now, is the declaration of our Lord, Matt. 25th chapter and 41st verse: "Then shall he say also to them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed," &c. They also shall answer him, saying—"When saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?" His answer then you may read, "Inasmuch as you did it not to the least of these, ye did it not to me." But we notice farther, that in the period from 1660 to 1760; that is, from 100 to 200 years ago, slaveholding was declared to be a sin condemned in the word of God, by Morgan Godwin, Richard Baxter, Dr. Primatt, Griffith Hughes, rector of St. Lucy, and others. How then is it possible that Dr. Raphael dared to make such an assertion, that "fifty years ago no man dreamt of slaveholding being condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture," when we find men of almost every evangelical denomination of christians, for the last 200 years up to the present time, declaring it to be such. And then what caps the climax of the Dr's. effrontery is, the additional statement made by him, for he adds; "with a due sense of my responsibility I must state to you the truth, and nothing but the truth." Now we ask any candid man, did the Dr. "state the truth, and nothing but the truth," when he said, that "fifty years ago no man dreamt of slaveholding being condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture?" With the array of witnesses we have produced against him, we fearlessly assert before judge and jury, that he has concealed the whole truth; and that his reputation as a witness for the truth, to say the least of it, on the sin of slaveholding, is very suspicious.

But the truth is, that not only have the most pious, and learned declared during the last 200 years, that "slavehold-

ing is a sin condemned in Sacred Scripture;" but the word of God as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments assert the same thing. Although this properly comes in under our fifth proposition, yet we may here say a word on it; and in Luke iv. 18; the text which our Saviour selected for his first sermon, we have satisfactory proof, viz: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." And also, in the Old Testament, in Ex. xxi. 16, it is said, "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Now observe, it does not say, "he that stealeth a *slave* and selleth him," nor "he that stealeth a *man-servant*, and selleth him," but "he that stealeth a *MAN*, shall surely be put to death." We ask then the Rev. Dr. Raphael, "how readest thou?" Does not the word of God itself denounce the condemnation of heaven against the sin of slaveholding.

The greater part however of this proposition is made up of declamations against the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, and with which we have nothing to do. There is nevertheless one attempt, and only one, made by the Dr. to prove that slaveholding is not condemned as a sin in the Sacred Scriptures, but sanctioned and commanded by the Almighty. Hear his argument and how he reasons;—"The property in slaves is placed under the same protection as any other species of lawful property, where it is said, "thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, or his field, or his male slave, or his female slave, or his ox, or his ass, or ought that belongeth to thy neighbour," Ex. xx. 17. Now any reader of the word of God, yea, every Sabbath School scholar, will at once detect the miserable trick attempted by the Dr. in the above quotation. The commandment as it stands in the word of God reads thus, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox,

nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's." But the Dr. in quoting the commandment, puts a man's house, his field, his man-servant, his maid-servant, and his ox, and his ass, all in the same category, but insidiously leaves out, "thy neighbour's wife." Now the individual, whether he be styled Dr. or Rabbi, or any thing else, who would stoop to such a wretched subterfuge, as to mangle the commandments of God, in order to prop up the sin of slavery, should be held in contempt by every conscientious, and Bible-loving christian. Why Dr. Raphael, though pretending to teach others, "needs," in the language of Paul, in Heb. v. 12, "that one teach him which be the first principles of the oracles of God." If however, as the Dr. says, "the property in slaves is placed under the same protection," by the tenth commandment, as a man's house, his ox, or his ass; is not the property in slaves, by the very same commandment, placed under the same protection as "a man's wife." But does the marriage relation, by the law of God, make a man's wife his chattle? or does it degrade the wife to the level of the brute creation? Suppose however we admit, that the Dr. has proved from the tenth commandment, that "the property in slaves is placed under the same protection," as a man's ox, or his ass; that is, his right to buy and sell, and own as property, "man-servants and maid-servants," then it is evident, as we have already said, from the very same commandment, that a man has precisely the same right of property in his *wife*; and may therefore sell her, or convert her into a beast of burden. This is evident, for the commandment says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," as well as, "thou shalt not covet his man-servant, nor his maid-servant." The Dr. seems to think, that whatever belongs to an individual that he can claim as his, is such in the sense of "property," that is, which he may sell, or dispose of in any way he may please. But a man's wife is *his*, and by virtue of the marriage relation, he can claim her as his own; and therefore, on the Dr's. reasoning, his "property," to be sold, or disposed of as any other article of merchandise. The Dr. reasons on the supposition, that a man's "wife," and his "man-servant," and

his "maid-servant," and his "ox," and his "ass," are all his by one and the same relation. But it is this, in which the fallacy of his argument consists, and hence by endeavoring to prove too much from the commandment, he has in reality proved nothing; and in addition stands convicted of the crime of taking from the words of Sacred Scripture. The Dr. then has completely failed to prove under his second proposition, that "slaveholding is not condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture," but commanded and sanctioned by the Almighty. The affirmative however of this proposition, viz. that "slaveholding is condemned as a sin in Sacred Scripture," we shall prove when we come to discuss the fifth thesis in our method of arrangement.

We come now to review the third proposition of Rev. Dr. Raphael, viz. "What was the condition of the slave in Biblical times among the Hebrews?"

Now it is in the disquisition of this problem that the Dr's. great strength seems to lie. But when stript of his sophistry, and the unwarrantable liberties taken by him with the word of God, (for he makes and unmakes Scripture at his pleasure, and to suit his purposes) he will appear in his true colors strutting about in the borrowed plumes of another LEGREE, a real "man-stealer," trying to make "merchandise of the bodies and souls of men." And in order to prove the scripturality of American slavery, from the nature of the servitude in Biblical times among the Hebrews, the Dr. displays considerable adroitness and cunning by wresting the Sacred Scriptures, and trying to make "the worse appear the better cause." But hear him on this part of his subject; he says, "and here we must at once distinguish between the Hebrew bondman and the heathen slave. The former could only be reduced to bondage from two causes. If he had committed theft and had not wherewithal to make full restitution he was "sold for his theft." (Ex. xx 11—13.) Or if he became so miserably poor that he could not sustain life except by begging, he had permission to "sell" or bind himself in servitude. (Lev. xxv. 39) But in either case his servitude was limited in dura-

tion and character. "Six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." (Exod. xxi. 2,) And if even the bondman preferred bondage to freedom, he could not, under any circumstances, be held to servitude longer than the jubilee then next coming. In fact, between the Hebrew bondman and the Southern slave there is no point of comparison. There were, however, slaves among the Hebrews whose general condition was analogous to that of his Southern fellow sufferer. That was the heathen slave, who was to be bought "from the heathen that were round about the land of Israel, or from the heathen strangers that sojourned in the land." "They should be a possession to be bequeathed as an inheritance to the owner's children after his death "forever." (Levit. xxv. 44—46.) Over these heathen slaves the owner's property was absolute; he could put them to hard labor, to the utmost extent of their physical strength; he could inflict on them any degree of chastisement short of injury to the life and limb."

That there were two kinds of servants among the Hebrews we admit, and this we will speak more of hereafter when we come under our second head to consider, the Hebrew servitude of the Old Testament; but that the second kind mentioned by the Dr. was as he describes it, we do most unequivocally deny. He admits, that "between the Hebrew bondman and the Southern slave there is no point of comparison." But he adds, "there were, however, slaves among the Hebrews whose general condition was analogous to that of his Southern fellow sufferer. And over these heathen slaves the owner's property was absolute." For proof of this the Dr. refers to Levit. xxv. 44—46. This passage we will here quote in full as much of the question in dispute is made to rest upon it. It is as follows; "Both thy bond-men and thy bond-maids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession: and ye shall take them as an inheritance for your

children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bond-men forever." Now the Dr.'s paraphrase of the text is this, "The heathen slave, who was to be bought from the heathen that were round about the land of Israel, or from the heathen strangers that sojourned in the land. They should be a possession to be bequeathed as an inheritance to the owner's children after his death "forever." As then this passage of Scripture is made the foundation on which the Dr. and his compeers, build their superstructure of American slavery, it will be necessary for us to consider it at some length. If the text will bear the construction put upon it by pro-slavery men, then there would seem to be some scriptural authority for hereditary enslavement, at least among the Jews; but if the explanation given of it be forced and foreign to the text, then the whole system of slaveholding founded upon it tumbles to the ground. Before, however, we give you a critical analysis of the passage, we wish you to observe, that in most all the portions of Scripture quoted by the Dr. in his sermon, he refuses to follow our present English translation, but gives his own version from the original; yet when he finds a passage, the English translation of which seems to favor his beloved scheme; he passes over in silence the Hebrew, as if it were the only correctly rendered passage in the whole Bible. You are not, however, from this to suppose, that we find fault with our excellent translation of the Scriptures. By no means, but since the passage is the stronghold for philo-slavery men—their Malakoff—their Fort Sumter—let us carefully examine it. The first then that claims our attention is the expression, "bond-men and bond-maids, of them shall ye buy, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bond-men forever." Now the words as they stand in the original, the Hebrew, may be literally translated as follows; "and they shall be to you for a possession, and ye shall as heirs possess yourselves of them, with your children after you, to enjoy the possession; by them ye shall be served." The meaning supposed to be

conveyed by the English translation is this; that the bond-men became personal property, and should be bequeathed as an inheritance to the slave owner's children after his death forever. But the Hebrew words convey no such idea, for the original term "an inheritance," means that the agent acting is also the object of the act. In other words, the inheritance simply belonged to the individual who bought the bond-men, but could not be bequeathed after his decease to his children, for to him belonged the heirship. To make this still more plain, there are five expressions in the passage that we shall consider in order. These are "bond-men"—"buy"—"possession"—"inheritance"—and "forever." And 1st respecting the word "bond-men," it is considered proof by some, that servants procured from the heathen were called in Scripture "bond-men," while those from the Hebrews are called "servants," and hence the former must have been *slaves*. This, however, is not the case, for the Hebrew word, *eveth*, which ought always to be translated *servant*, is sometimes rendered *servant*, sometimes *a bond servant*, and sometimes *a bond-man*. And the Hebrew word which the translators have rendered *bond-men*, in this passage, is the *very same* word which they uniformly render *servants* in other places. To show then the absurdity of supposing that the heathen servants were slaves because called "bond-men," let us look at the use of the Hebrew word *eveth*, the plural of which is here translated "bond-men." In i Kings xii. 7, the *very same word* is used by the old men to King Rehoboam; thus, "and they (the old men) spake unto him, (King Rehoboam) saying, 'If thou wilt be a *servant* (Heb. *eveth*) unto this people this day, and wilt serve them, and answer them, and speak good words to them, then they will be thy *servants* forever.'" Now did the old men by this, advise Rehoboam to be a *slave*, a *bond-man*, or chattel property to the people, and his descendants forever, through all generations? Why the thing is absurd; and yet it must have been so, if the Hebrew word translated "bond-man" means a *slave*. Again, in Isaiah xlii. 1, the *very same word*, *avdi*, is applied to Christ; thus, "Behold my *servant*, (*avdi*) whom I uphold;"

&c. And in Isaiah lii. 13, it is also said of Christ, "Behold, my *servant* (*avdi*) shall deal prudently;" &c. But who will dare to affirm, from this, that the eternal Son of God by taking the mediatorial office on himself, and becoming man, was thereby reduced to the state of a *bond-man*, a *slave*; or that he ever ceased to be Jehovah the second person in the Godhead? And yet this blasphemous absurdity we must believe, if the heathen servants among the Jews by being styled "bond-men" were therefore *slaves*. The truth is, the word is applied to *all* persons who do service for others; viz. to magistrates, to all the subjects of governments, to Prophets, to Kings, to the Messiah, and not less than *fifty* times, in respectful addresses, in the Old Testament. In the English language we have the word *slave* as well as *servant*, because we have the *thing*, we are sorry to say; but the Hebrew language had no word corresponding to *slave*, or *slavery*, as meaning personal property or chattles.

So much for the word "bond-men," and now let us notice the 2nd word, viz. "buy"—"of them shall ye *buy* (*tiknu*) bond-men and bond-maids." The inference that the word "buy," means procuring of servants as *property* or *chattles*, is based on the fallacy; that whatever, or whoever you pay money *for* is an article of property, and the simple fact of paying for it *proves* that it is property. It is true, the English word *buy* conveys, the idea of merchandise and of property; but the word in the original has no such idea attached to it. It is the *same word* that is used for marrying a wife. Thus in Gen. xxix. 15 - 28; Jacob *bought* Rachel and Leah his wives, and paid for each of them to Laban seven years' work. Also in Ruth iv. 10: it is the same Hebrew word that is used; thus, "Moreover, Ruth the Moabitess, have I *purchased* to be my wife." And the prophet Hosea is said to have *bought* his wife; thus in Hosea iii. 2, "so I *bought* her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for an homer of barley, and for an half homer of barley." If then *buying servants* among the Jews proves that they were property, and if the fact of their being bought is sufficient proof; then the buying *wives* shows

that *they* also were property, and the fact that *they* were bought is sufficient evidence. And remember, that the words in the original which are used to describe the one, describe the other also.

But farther on this point, we maintain, that if the word *buy* or *bought*, when applied to the heathen "bond-man," proves them to be slaves, that is property or chattles; then the Hebrew servants were also slaves of the same kind, and for the same reason. But this Dr. Raphael, and his compeers will not be willing to admit. And now for the proof; thus in Ex. xxi. 2, "If thou *buy* (tikneh) an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." Here we have the very *same* word "*buy*" used in reference to a free contract and for free service. And in Jer. xxxiv. 14, it is likewise said, "at the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother an Hebrew, which hath been *sold* unto thee." But this surely cannot mean, that the "brother Hebrew" became a slave, or chattle property, because it is said, "which hath been *sold* unto thee." And to come still closer to the point; in Lev. xxv. 47, the very next verse to the one where we find the heathen servants bought or engaged till the Jubilee, we have precisely the same thing with regard to a Hebrew servant engaged to a heathen master till the Jubilee. It is there said "sell himself unto the stranger," but in v. 51st this Hebrew servant is said to have been *bought*; thus, "out of the money that he was *bought* for." And it is not a little remarkable, that the *same* word, and the *same* form of the word, which, in the 47th verse is rendered "sell him self," that is in the 39th verse of the same chapter rendered "be sold," or as it is in the original (aim-moch) *sell himself*; that is, the very same free contract, and free service. The words then "*buy*" and *sell*, are never used in the Scriptures to denote, or sanction such a thing as property in man. Neither is there a single instance recorded in the word of God, with the exception of Joseph being sold into Egypt, of a servant being sold by any one but himself. And we challenge Dr. Raphael, and all pro-slavery men to produce a solitary case either under the Pa-

triarchal, or the Mosaic systems, in which a master ever sold his servant.

So much then for the word "buy," and now we shall notice the 3rd expression in the passage, viz. "possession,"—"they shall be your possession." That is, the individuals from the heathen round about, who sold themselves, or engaged by contract to be servants to the Hebrews, "they shall be your possession." And regarding the word "possession," in the law of Moses, we affirm, that when used in the singular it never means *property in general*. But by some "possession" is supposed to mean *property*, and when applied to bond-men that they were property. We challenge Rev. Dr. Raphael, or any other man, to produce one single instance, from the law of Moses, where "*possession*" is used to signify *personal property or chattles*. A man's house, his ox, or his ass, could not be called according to the Mosaic law, his "possession," but his personal property, and this he might convey to another, by sale, or bequest; but under the law of Moses, the bond-servant never became the chattle of a Hebrew, but merely his "possession." We must ever bear in mind, that the term "possession," in the law of Moses, is always used to denote the real estate interest, or a *mere possessory interest*, which belonged to the individual during the actual possession or occupation of the land, but no longer. Thus in Numbers xxvi. 52—56: "And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, unto these the land shall be divided for an inheritance, according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to few thou shalt give the less inheritance: to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot; according to the names of the tribes of their fathers they shall inherit. According to the lot shall the *possession* thereof be divided between many and few." Now the word "possession" here, is used with regard to the land, to teach us, that all the interest a Hebrew had in it accrued to him simply by his having it in his possession. And in Levit. 25th chapter, where the term "*possession*" is applied to "bond-men and bond-maids," it

occurs no less than eleven times, and both there, and every where else in the Mosaic law, it is used in the same sense. It is a mistaken opinion then, and in this is the sophistry of Dr. Raphael's, and all pro-slavery arguments, viz. That the Hebrews enjoyed the right of selling the land which they held in *possession*, and likewise their bond-servants. But no Hebrew had any such right, and for proof of this read in Levit. xxv. 23, 24; "The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me. And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land." No Israelite then, from the highest to the lowest, had any right, either to sell, or alienate, or in any way part with his "possession." He might sell his ox, or his ass, or any thing that was his personal property, but the law gave him no power, nor right to sell his "possession," whether it was his land or his bond-servant. Let Dr. Raphael then, and all such know, what the law saith to them that were under it, that no Israelite held his "bond-man" as personal property or chattle, which he might sell, but just as he held his landed possession, under the positive denial of Almighty God, forbidding him to sell, or transfer, in any way, his right to another. We may merely add here, that the Hebrew for "possession," is *achusoh*, and is the same word that is used, whether it be the *land*, or the *bond-servant* that is denominated the "possession."

But let us now notice the 4th expression in the passage, viz. "inheritance,"—"ye shall take them as an *inheritance* for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession." We have already considered the tenure of the "*possession*," and showed that "bond-men" could not be held as a *property* possession; and that they were in no sense *chattles*. And now we ask, were the benefits derived from the services of the bond-servants as a *possession* to be an "inheritance," such that the law authorized the master by his testamentary will to bequeath the interest he had in them to his children after him as his heirs throughout their generations? To this we have no hesitation in asserting that under the law of Moses there could be no *hereditary* sla-

very; the servants were not accounted *property*, and hence there could be no *hereditary* property in them. Such being the case then, it may still be asked, what are we to understand by the phrase, "to inherit," and "inheritance?" We answer, that to "inherit," means *to enjoy*, and "inheritance," *that which is enjoyed*. Thus in Numbers xxxii. 18, it is said, "We will not return unto our houses, until the children of Israel have inherited every man his inheritance," that is, appropriated to themselves the land for a possession, not by the testamentary will of their ancestors, but as a free gift from the Almighty who gave the land to Abraham and his seed for a possession. The land did not belong to them by the will or testament of their parents, but by virtue of their heirship in being the children of Abraham; and so was it also with regard to their bond-servants. But some one may say, the cases are not parallel, for the master paid his money for his bond servant, which he did not do for the land, and hence the servant was his by right of purchase. Well grant this, and then the objection will overthrow the thing sought to be established, viz. that the use and services of the bond-servant were hereditary, because he was a purchased possession, and therefore the children of the parent or purchaser could not claim them by right of inheritance. But the fact is, the expression "an inheritance for your children after you to inherit them for a possession," refers not to the *bond-servants* themselves, but to the nations round about them from whence they were to obtain their bond-men and bond-maids. Let us, however, see from the Sacred Scriptures, if the words "*inherit*," and "*inheritance*," are used in the sense of *articles of property*, or *chattles*. Now the Hebrew words for "*inherit*," and "*inheritance*," are *nachal*, and *nachaltem*; and let us see their meaning in the word of God. Thus for example, in Ex. xxxiv. 9, it is said, "O Lord, pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine *inheritance*." Now is it true, that when God pardons the iniquity of his people, and adopts them into his family, that he makes them *articles of property*, or *chattles*? Again in ii Chron. x. 16, it is written, "the people answered the king (Rehoboam) saying,

what portion have we in David? and we have none *inheritance* (cheilek) in the son of Jesse." Now did they mean by this, that they disowned holding the king any longer as *chattle*, or an *article of property*? The same thing we have in Ps. ii. 8, and Ezek. xlv. 27, 28. The terms then to "inherit," and "an inheritance for your children after you," do not mean, that the law of Moses gave any license or authority for parents or masters of bond-servants, to bequeath them, as Dr. Raphael says, to their children after their death "forever," as an inheritance.

But we will now notice the 5th and last expression in the passage, viz. "forever,"—"they shall be your bond-men (leaulom) *for ever*." And before we make any remarks on the word "forever," it is worthy of notice, that in Lev. xxv. 46, the word *bond-men* is inserted in the English version, but there is not only no such word, but nothing answering to it, in the original Hebrew. Instead then of reading it as it is in the English version, "they shall be your *bond-men* forever," it is, "they shall be yours forever," that is, the heathen nations from whence by contract you shall obtain your bond-men and bond-maids, or your servants. But Dr. Raphael does not tell us of this mistake; no, but he quotes the passage as if there was a corresponding word in the Hebrew for "*bond-men*." In charity to Dr. Raphael we will suppose that he was ignorant of it, and yet we can scarcely suppose that it escaped his notice, only it did not suit his purpose to direct attention to it. But now for the word "forever." And the term "forever" is quoted to prove that the bondage of servants was *perpetual*; that they were to serve during their whole life time, and if they survived their owners, that both they and their children, if any, should be bequeathed from parent to children, from generation to generation. *Forever* always means *throughout the term*. Sometimes it means eternity; and sometimes, defined portions of time. But Dr. Raphael's theory, and slaveholders in general, that the phrase here means *for life*, is utterly impossible. *Forever* is *never* once used in the law of Moses to signify a man's life-time; no, *never*. No such idea, as that advanced by Dr. Raphael, is contained in the

passage, nor any where in the law of Moses on the subject of servitude. It may then be asked, what is its real import or meaning? We answer that if the word (leaulom) "forever" is to be read in connection with the last clause of the verse, then it means that the duration of their service must cease in the Jubilee; and the "forever" refers to the period from the commencement of their servitude until the Jubilee, when it should terminate if master and servant lived till then. Now for proof of this observe, that the term *forever* is used both with reference to the Hebrew servant and the heathen bond-man. Thus in Ex. xxi. 6, "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post: and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him (leaulom) *forever*." Now it is admitted on all hands, that this passage refers to the *Hebrew servant*, who, after the expiration of his six years service, voluntarily agreed to serve his master till the Jubilee. And it is also agreed on all hands, without a single exception, even by Dr. Raphael, that the Hebrew servant could not be a *slave*, but if he agreed to the *forever service*, that is, till the Jubilee, then in the Jubilee he was free. But the cases are precisely parallel, and the language is exactly the same in the original Hebrew with respect to the *Hebrew servant* and the *heathen bond-man*. To see this read Ex. xxi. 6, and Levit. xxv. 46; together; thus, "and he (the Hebrew servant) shall serve him (leaulom) *forever*." And "they shall be your bond-men (leaulom) *forever*." Now with regard to the *Hebrew servant*, in the first passage, it is allowed, and cannot be denied, that *forever* means till the Jubilee, when he became free; and no master could hold any servant one hour longer than that period. And with respect to the *heathen bond-man*, in the second passage, where it is said, "they shall be your bond-men *forever*," it must mean till the Jubilee, when they became free, and could not be detained one hour longer. Besides, as we have already said, the word *bond-men* is not in the original in Levit. xxv. 46. And hence it should be read as in Ex. xxi. 6; "they shall serve you (leaulom) *forever*,"

that is, as the Hebrew servant, *till the Jubilee*, but no longer.

But farther, if the word "forever" is to be placed at the close of the verse which it qualifies, then it means the perpetuity of the statute during that dispensation. As much as to say, "here is an edict allowing you to take bond-servants of the heathen round about you, and this ye are privileged and permitted to do during the whole of this dispensation, even *forever*." Now that this is the meaning of the phrase "forever," is evident from other passages where the word is used. Thus in Ex. xii. 14. The Almighty says concerning the Passover, "ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance (aolom) *forever*." It is evident then, that the word (aolom) "forever" here means, the continuance of the passover feast during that dispensation. And in Ex. xxvii. 21, it is said, "it shall be a statute *forever* (aolom) unto their generations on behalf of the children of Israel." That is, the children of Israel were "to bring pure oil-olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always. It shall be a statute *forever*;" evidently meaning during that dispensation. Also in Ex. xxviii. 43, "It shall be a statute *forever* unto him, and his seed after him." That is, during that dispensation Aaron and his sons should put on "the linen breeches" when they came near unto the altar to minister. And on the same thing see in Levit. vi. 18, vii. 34, 36. Numb. xviii. 23. The whole then of the passage may be summed up and paraphrased thus; "of the heathen that are round about you, and of the strangers that do sojourn among you; of them, and of their families that are with you, ye shall *procure*, by contract, both thy bond-men and thy bond-maids for *servants*; and they shall be your possession, *not as articles of property or chattles*, but by the same tenure that you hold your land possessions. And ye shall as *heirs*, by virtue of being the descendants of Abraham, possess yourselves of them, with your children after you, for the heathen nations are given you as an inheritance, and ye shall enjoy the possession forever, during the whole of the present dispensation, and ye shall serve yourselves of or with them."

We have spent more time on this passage than we at first intended; but as it is the strong-hold for philo-slavery men we considered it necessary, before we reviewed the remaining part of the Dr's. discourse. Seeing then that the passage gives no countenance to the idea of *chattle-property* in slaves, nor yet to the *perpetuity* or *hereditament* in slavery; we are the better prepared for demolishing the superstructure raised thereon.

The Dr. then goes on and says, "If his heathen slave ran away or strayed from home, every Israelite was bound to bring or send him back, as he would have to do any other portion of his neighbour's property that had been lost or strayed. (Deut. xxii. 3.) Now, you may, perhaps, ask me how I can reconcile this statement with the text of Scripture so frequently quoted against the Fugitive Slave law, "Thou shalt not surrender unto his master the slave who is escaped from his master unto thee." Deut. xxiii. 15. We have already convicted the Dr. of taking from the word of God, and here he is guilty of an equally egregious crime, that of adding to the Sacred Scriptures; and that too for the purpose of supporting and defending one of the greatest sins that ever disgraced the character of man. Read the words as we find them in Deut. xxii. 3; but misquoted by the Dr. Here they are, "In like manner shalt thou do with his ass, and so shalt thou do with his raiment; and with all lost thing of thy brother's, which he hath lost, and thou hast found, shalt thou do likewise: thou mayest not hide thyself." He says this proves, that "if his heathen slave ran away or strayed from home, every Israelite was bound to bring or send him back, as he would have to do any other portion of his neighbour's property that had been lost or strayed." But we ask, is the word *slave*, or *servant*, or *bond-man*, or *bond-maid*, mentioned in the whole of the passage? Most unquestionable not; but cautiously excluded by the great Lawgiver, the God of heaven. And yet this Jewish Rabbi would dare to amend, (as he foolishly supposes) the word of the living God by foisting into the passage the word *slave*. Many a poor fellow is serving out his term in the penitentiary for forgery not half

so criminal or so daringly reckless. In verse 1st of the same chapter, it is the "ox or the sheep," that is to be returned to the owner, if they have strayed; and in v. 3rd; "In like manner shalt thou do with his ass, and so shalt thou do with his raiment." But not one word about slaves, or servants, or bond-men; and why? Evidently because they were not to be returned, and so the Almighty says in Deut. xxiii. 15; "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." And the Apostle Paul in i Cor. vii. 21; says, "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." That is, as Dr. Scott says, "if he had a fair opportunity of obtaining his freedom, he would do well to embrace it." But perhaps the Dr. may say, the expression, "all lost *thing* of thy brothers," must mean his slaves or his servants. This however we deny; and when the Spirit of God has occasion to mention the servants of a man he specifies them as separate or distinct from his ox, or his ass, or any of his chattle property. Thus for instance in the Tenth commandment; "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's." And farther, the words "all lost thing of thy brothers," is compared to and put in the same category with his "ox, or his sheep, his ass and his raiment." And in the parallel passage in Ex. xxiii. 4, 5, the "ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again," but no mention of the servants or bond-men. And I would here affirm, from the Dr's. own statement in the sermon, that had it not have been for the "vail upon his heart," he never could for a moment suppose, that the word "thing" meant a man's slaves or his servants. Hear his own language, he says, "the slave is a person in whom the dignity of human nature is to be respected; he has rights. Whereas the heathen view of slavery which prevailed at Rome, and which I am sorry to say, is adopted in the South, reduces the slave to a thing, and a thing can have no rights." Now has not the Dr. here plainly con-

demned his own exposition of the text, and in the language of the Psalmist we may justly say of him, "the words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit," Ps. xxxvi. 3.

We will now show the falsity of the Dr's. exposition by confronting him with what the Misnah of his own (the Jewish) church says on this passage. The Misnah, be it observed, is the oral law of the Jewish church, and is preferred by them to the written law, the Scriptures of truth. A writer of their own, (R. Sangari) says of it, "the brevity of its words, the elegance of its composition, and its beautiful order, if a man looks upon them, must own, that flesh and blood could never compose any thing like it, but by divine assistance." Now in the Misnah C. 2. Sect. 9, on this passage in Deut. xxii. 3, it is asked, "what is a lost thing?" and it answers, "if a man finds an ox or a cow feeding in the way, this is not a lost thing; but an ass whose instruments are inverted, and a cow running among the vineyards, this is a lost thing." But there is not one word in the Misnah about bond-men or slaves as included in the word "thing." With respect then to domestic animals going astray, the law was express in requiring every Israelite to use proper means to restore them to their owner. But we find no such law for compelling runaway slaves or bond-men to be forced back when once they have escaped and obtained their freedom; and the absence of such a command in the Mosaic law is of itself evidence that Jehovah designed their emancipation. But we are not left here to grope our way in the dark on this subject, we have the positive law of God himself saying in Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." Now on this passage Dr. R. says, "all legists applies this text to a heathen slave who from any foreign country escapes from his master, even though that master be an Hebrew, residing out of the land of Israel. Such a slave—and such a slave only—is to find a permanent asylum in any part of the country he may

choose." But to prove the fallacy of this statement, I will here again confront the Dr. with the opinion of a very learned Jewish expositor on this passage. I mean Jarchi; and on Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, he says, "this is to be understood of a Canaanitish servant of an Israelite that flees (from his master) without the land, where he was not obliged to go with him, and serve him against his will." Now this completely overthrows the groundless assertion of Dr. R. viz. that "it applies to a heathen slave from a foreign country," for Jarchi says, it refers to "a Canaanitish servant of an Israelite."

But that the law in the passage is to be limited to runaway slaves from the heathen, as Dr. R. says, we shall now show to be false. And 1st. There is nothing in the language to limit its meaning, nor in the connection in which it is found; it is not restricted to any *class of servants*, neither from the heathen any more than from an Israelite. And 2nd. There is no allusion in the passage to *foreign* masters, nor to the tenure by which they held their servants; neither is there any thing in the whole history of the Mosaic law to limit this command to the case of servants escaping from foreign masters. The assumption then of Dr. R. is wholly gratuitous, and as far as the word of God is concerned, without the shadow of evidence. We are clearly taught by it, that escape from bondage was not a crime, but the exercise of a natural and equitable right, neither was it criminal to harbor the runaway who was escaping from oppression: and what was commanded on the ground of its being oppression, would also be oppression to a servant fleeing from a Hebrew master, as well as to one fleeing from a heathen master.

But suppose we admit the Dr's. exposition, it avails him after all nothing; it merely removes the difficulty to another point. For, if the law of God held the broad shield of its protection over *the free choice of a single servant* from the heathen, how could it command the same persons to depress *the free choice of thousands* of servants from the heathen. That is, if a servant of his *free choice* escaping from a foreign master to the Israelites, is not to be returned

back again to his master, but is to enjoy his liberty, and dwell where he chooses; how could the same servant, if instead of coming into Israel of his free choice, he had been kidnapped and sold to an Israelite, be held in bondage, and if he escapes be forced back again under the yoke of oppression. Ezek. xiii. 18. And farther here observe, the command was not merely, "Thou shalt not deliver him to his master," but "he (the servant) shall dwell with thee, in that place which *he shall choose* in one of the gates where it liketh *him* best." Here every Israelite was required to respect his *free choice*, and to put him in no condition *against his will*. And was not this plainly the mind and will of God, that those who *chose* to live in the land and obey the laws, were left to their own free will, to dispose of their services as could best be agreed on, and to such as they pleased.

But let us examine a little farther this supposition of Dr. R. viz. that "a slave from a foreign country who escapes from his master, should not be delivered unto his master; even though that master be an Hebrew, residing out of the land of Israel." Now this must mean, either that the Bible sanctions slavery *only* in the land of Israel; or, that it would be *sinful* to hold slaves in any other land except the land of Israel. We maintain then, that the Dr's. statement must mean one or other of these two things, or both. But if the first, viz. that the Bible sanctions slavery *only* in the land of Israel, then it is evident, that slavery is not sanctioned, nor legalized by the word of God either in America, or in any other part of the world, but in the land of Israel, and such being the case there is no divine warrant for American slavery, But if the other, viz. that it is *sinful* to hold slaves in any other country but Israel, or the land of Judea; and that the word of God forbids to return "a heathen slave who from any foreign country escapes from his master," then it is evident, that to return a runaway slave, by compulsion, to his master is *sinful*. But what the law of God, the infallible standard of right, and only rule of faith and practice, declares to be *sinful* in one country, must be so in every country, and binding on every

individual favored with that law. Were this not so, then a holy and righteous God lowers the standard of rectitude to suit the wishes of avaricious men, and grants to sinners a license to commit iniquity, and to "continue in sin, that grace may abound." But shall we believe this? "God forbid." And yet we must so believe, and so act, if the teachings of Dr. R. are to be credited. But thank God, "we have a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." And "we have not so learned Moses, nor the prophets, nor Christ Jesus."

But for support of the Dr's. theory, let us hear him in the following argument. He says, "This interpretation is fully borne out by the words of the precept; the pronoun 'thou' is not here used in the same sense as in the Ten commandments. There it designates every soul in Israel; but here, the pronoun 'thou' used in this precept designates the whole people of Israel." "Who shall escape unto thee" likewise meaning the whole people, and not a portion of the people, in opposition to another part of the people. And as the expression remains the same throughout the precept, "with thee he shall dwell even among you in the place he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best," it plainly shows that the whole of the land was open to him, and the whole of the people were to protect the fugitive, which could not have been carried out if it had applied to the slave who escaped from one tribe into the territory of another." What seems to be intended by all this is, that *the moral law*, "summarily comprehended in the Ten commandments," was given to, and binding only upon a *portion* of the people; but that the precept contained in *the judicial law*, "thou shalt not surrender unto his master the slave who is escaped from his master unto thee," is more comprehensive, and designates the *whole* of the people. Hear the Dr's. own words, "the pronoun *thou*," that is, in the Ten commandments, "designates every soul in Israel, but the pronoun 'thou' used in this precept (Deut. xxiii. 15, 16,) designates the whole people of Israel." Now what is the difference in limitation or extension, between the "every soul in Israel," and "the whole people of Israel," it

is difficult, I confess, to determine. But he adds, "who shall escape unto thee, likewise meaning the whole people, and not a portion of the people, in opposition to another part of the people." Now this statement shows us, that the Dr. considers the precept in Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, to comprise more than the Ten commandments; or, he considers the judicial law of the Jewish nation to be more comprehensive than the moral law. From the Dr's. language this can only be his meaning. But is this the case? We have been accustomed to consider, that the Ten commandments were delivered to Moses, and the whole children of Israel, at mount Sinai; and that the ceremonial and judicial laws were grafted upon the moral law, the ceremonial upon the first table, and the judicial upon the second. But the secret of the Dr's. exposition about the two "thous" comes out in what he farther adds. "Had (says he) the precept," (that is in Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, "thou shalt not surrender unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee,") "been expounded in any other than its strictly literal sense it would have caused great confusion, since it would have nullified two other precepts of God's law—that which directs that 'slaves,' like lands and houses, were to be disinherited forever, and that which commands property, lost or strayed, to be restored to the owner." Now from this, it is manifest, the Dr. had to manufacture something to make his favorite scheme of slavery tally, as he supposed, with the word of God; and hence he tries to draw the "vail" over others, that "their minds" may also be "blinded." The sophism of the Dr. here is this; that "slaves and houses" and sheep and asses are property equal and alike; and that a slave is "a thing" a mere chattle. But this we have already explained in our remarks on Levit. xxv. 44—46, and hence we may reply to the whole of the Dr's. reasoning, in the language of Isaiah, he "has been in pain, he has as it were brought forth wind; and he has not wrought any deliverance in the earth."

But to sum up all, the Dr. closes with three examples; the first is, that "the runaway from Edom or Syria found

an asylum in the land of Israel, as the runaway slave from Cuba or Brazil would find in New York." But why select New York, and not say some of the slave states? Would, we ask, a runaway slave from Cuba or Brazil find an asylum, and be allowed to live in any part he might *choose* in South Carolina, or Georgia, or Kentucky? Why a *free negro* would not find a safe asylum much less "a runaway." Witness, for example, the free negro law passed at the last session of the Kentucky Legislature. It makes it a felony punishable with imprisonment in the penitentiary, for a *free negro* to enter the state for the purpose of residing therein. And one section of the statute actually prohibits free negroes that have left the state from returning again; and this law is now in full force in that state. Talk then about "runaway negroes" finding an asylum in slave states; why you may as well talk of human beings finding an asylum in the bottomless pit with the devil and his angels.

But the second example of the Dr.'s. is, "Shimei reclaimed and recovered his runaway slaves from Achish, king of Gath, at that time a vassal of Israel; i Kings ii. 39, 40." True, we say, Shimei did follow after two of his servants to bring them back; and this is the only instance recorded in the whole word of God of slave-hunting. But who, we ask, was this Shimei? We reply, on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, that he was a perjured liar, a condemned hypocrite, and an irreverent blasphemer. Read the account given of him in ii Samuel xvi. 5—8. i Kings ii. 8, 9. With all our heart we make a present of Shimei to Dr. Raphael, and in him he will no doubt see a striking type of Southern slave-hunters. What! Shimei an example to imitate; a man who cast stones at king David, and cursed "the Lord's anointed." Truly it is no wonder his servants ran away from him, if his conduct to them resembled his wickedness to the man after God's own heart. Besides this, Dr. R. should have told us the doom he met in consequence of hunting his servants. In i Kings ii. 41, it is said, "and it was told Solomon that Shimei had gone from Jerusalem to Gath, and was come again." That was, as Dr. R. says, "to hunt his slaves." But was this a sufficient

excuse to offer king Solomon? or, did Shimei plead in his defence any fugitive slave law of either God or man for justification, or extenuation of his conduct? No, he was silent; and hence it is recorded, "the king commanded Benaiah the son of Jehoiada; which went out, and fell upon him, that he died." And so that was what Shimei, Dr. R's. slave-holder, got for "hunting slaves."

But the Dr's. third, and last example, is, the case of the Apostle Paul and Onesimus; he says, "and Saul of Tarsus sent back the runaway slave Onesimus unto his owner Philemon." Now the whole account of this transaction we have recorded in the epistle of Paul to Philemon; and as much stress is laid upon it by philo-slavery men, both Jew and Gentile, permit us in conclusion to notice it a little. And here it is to be noticed, that if ever Onesimus was the slave of Philemon, in the strict sense of the word, it does not appear from the language of the epistle; all that appears is this, that he was an unconverted servant when he left Philemon. Just read the epistle—there are but 25 verses in the whole—and then see if there be any thing in it like slaveholding, slavery, or fugitive slave law. Had Paul caught Onesimus as a runaway slave from Philemon a slaveholder, and sent him word, we might well hear him in his epistle use some such language as the following. "Philemon, my good fellow, I have caught your fugitive slave Onesimus, and I am happy to inform you without incurring the expense of engaging a pack of keen-scented blood hounds to hunt him up. The rascal was lurking about the city Rome, and I got the Marshall and a posse of police to handcuff and drag the scoundrel before the Recorder; and I tell you Philemon, the magistrates did their duty in noble style. They at once ordered the victim to be bound with chains, and sent back as a slave to his master. And when you receive him, my advice is, to gather all your other slaves together, and tie him with strong ropes to a stake fastened in the ground; but be sure and first strip him naked, and then make the rest of the slaves inflict, at least, 200 lashes on his bare flesh until the blood shall flow from neck to heel, and in this condition send him to the field of

unrequited toil, and there make him work with the other field hands. This Philemon is what the law of God sanctions, and you know our blessed Redeemer never said a word against slavery, neither do we his commissioned Apostles. Now fail not my brave Philemon to support the honor and majesty of the divine law, be sure and punish the runaway to your heart's content, and at the same time don't forget to send me 25 or 30 pieces of silver for my trouble in catching the fugitive." Now is there any thing like this in Paul's epistle to Philemon concerning Onesimus? Not one syllable; but hear what the Apostle says. At v. 13th. "Whom I would have retained," observe, *would* have done it, and could have done it, for the law of God has said, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." But why then did Paul send him back when the law said, that he should and could "retain" him? The Apostle immediately answers this, and gives the reason for sending him back, he says at v. 16th "Thou shouldst receive him, not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved." Here Paul tells Philemon that he is now to receive him "not as a servant, but a brother." Observe, as a servant, Onesimus was "*not*" to be received; as "a brother," he was. The Apostle says, he was now to be elevated "above a servant;" and at v. 12th he tells us how much "above a servant," for he says, "thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels." He was to receive him as he naturally would a son of the Apostle; and then farther adds at v. 17th, "receive him as myself." Now I know that to all this, Dr. R. and philo-slavery advocates, will say, "yes Philemon was to receive Onesimus as a brother *spiritually*, but he was at the same time to use him as a slave *carnally*. That is, he might go to church with Philemon, or kneel with him in the prayer-meeting, *spiritually*; and then he might whip him and sell him when he got him home, *carnally*. But the Spirit of God foresaw all such miserable subterfuges as these, and hence the Apostle says at v. 16th, "receive him as a brother beloved, *both in the flesh and in the Lord.*" That is, in all the relations of life, both as a man, and as a *Christian*.

But some one may say, that all this goes to prove, that Onesimus was a slave to Philemon, in the strict sense of the word, when he ran away. By no means, this we deny, and so the Apostle guards us against any such a supposition. He says at v. 18th and 19th "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it." Now is not this language wholly inconsistent with the idea that Onesimus ever was a slave to Philemon. If Paul had believed that it was right to hold men as property, or that Onesimus was rightfully held as a slave, how could he have doubted that he owed his master service for life? As a slave, could Onesimus owe any thing but service for life? Or, if Paul believed slaveholding right, would he have required of Philemon to give up his rightful claim of service? One of two things here must be true; viz. either Onesimus was not a slave, or the Apostle believed slaveholding sinful, and that slaves ought to be freed. But had Onesimus been a slave in the strict sense, then the Apostle would have said, "receive him not now as a *slave*, (*andrapodon*) but above a *slave*;" instead of saying, receive him "not now as a *servant*, (*doulos*) but above a *servant*." Dr. R. and all the advocates of slavery go on the supposition, that in the word of God, servant means slave, and master means slaveholder; and also that these terms are correlative and convertible. But this is a most erroneous opinion. The term *servant* occurs in the Scriptures about 122 times; but the word, definitely meaning a *slave*, does not once occur in the whole Bible. A slave is *andrapodon*, from *aner* a man, and *pous* the foot. And the term for slaveholding is once, and only once, found in the New Testament. In i Tim. i. 9, 10, it is said, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, and for men-stealers," &c. Now here slaveholders are classed with "murderers, whoremongers, the lawless and disobedient," and against whom the just judgments of heaven are denounced in the most awful and explicit terms. The word in the original is *andrapodistais*, and literally means *men-dealers*, or slaveholders, but rendered "*men-stealers*," be-

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 001 706 929 9

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955